

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-20 are presented for further examination. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12, 15, and 17-20 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 9, and 14 have been canceled.

In the Office Action mailed October 18, 2004, the Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis of "the block." The foregoing amendments have corrected the informality.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,498,789 ("Honda"). Claims 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Figure 1 of the present application. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, and 14 were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 15-17 and 20 were allowed.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the bases for the rejections and request reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

The disclosed and claimed embodiments of the present invention are directed to a RAKE receiver capable of significantly reducing hardware size by using only one FIFO. As described in the present application, the FIFO performs a timing alignment of a multi-path signal and outputs a combined signal. Thus, the present invention executes in multiple paths for a RAKE receiver.

Honda, U.S. Patent No. 6,498,789, is directed to a CDMA mobile communications device that controls a received long code through the use of a FIFO buffer control section that reads a long code and by a symbol combining section combine symbols received over paths and output from a RAKE receiving section at the cycle of a reference clock signal and demodulating the combined signal through use of a received long code. Honda teaches the use of multiple FIFOs 23a, 23b, and 23c (see Figure 5 of Honda), whereas in the present invention only one FIFO is used. Honda teaches that demodulation is available without a long code generator (3) by using a FIFO block (12). As understood from Figures 1, 4, and 5 of the Honda patent, the FIFO does not output a combined signal. Moreover, combining elements 9g, 9h, and 9i of Figures 1 and 4 of Honda is a combining that is executing at QPSK despreading, which is different from a combining of signals in multiple paths in a RAKE receiver.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations found in now-canceled claims 2 and 4. Thus, claim 1 is now claim 4 rewritten into independent format to include all of the limitations of the intervening claim. Similarly, claim 7 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of allowed claim 9. Thus, claim 7 is now claim 9 rewritten into independent format.

Claim 12 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of allowable claim 14. Similarly, claim 18 has been amended similar to the amendments to claim 1. Finally, claim 19 was revised as a result of the amendment to claim 12.

In view of the foregoing arguments and the amendments set forth above, including the incorporation of allowable subject matter from claims 4, 9, and 14, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims remaining in this application are clearly in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jl

Enclosure:

Postcard

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

552530_1.DOC